PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

PROPOSER: MBCR #10

DATE: 9/6/2013

OVERALL RATING: Acceptable

NARRATIVE SUMMARY: The acceptable rating is a result of overall proposal content demonstrating ability to meet the stated criteria of the MBTA RFP. There are weaknesses that appear to be correctable. The proposal did allow me to understand how MBCR will develop, implement, operate, maintain and upgrade the IT organization and related systems and elements to meet RFP requirements.

The weaknesses of most concern are:

1. The absence of any reference in this section to ANSI/ISO/ASQ 9001-2000 which is the overall primary quality tool or equivalent that appears in the RFP Quality section on page 196. It appears as the IT quality element is planned to be addressed through meeting the RFP Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) requirement. I haven't been exposed to an ITIL standard managed environment and am unable to determine if it has the ability to be equal to ANSI/ISO/ASQ 9001-2000.
2. The RFP requires an IT Change Control Board to exist to review/approve proposed IT changes. MBCR appears to plan to modify this function by combining it with the IT Steering Committee function to create a dual function group; this has the potential to compromise the change approval process regarding any proposed changes that may have been developed through steering committee activities.

Objective:

The following are the objectives for the Information Technology Service Plan evaluation factor:

1) To identify Proposers that demonstrate ability to operate a professional information technology (IT) organization that follows and complies with industry best practices, uses metrics to monitor and improve performance, and successfully operates, maintains, and upgrades the full suite of IT systems and elements needed for delivery of the Commuter Rail

Operating Agreement services and the Commuter Rail IT Environment;

2) To identify Proposers with experience complying with standards and best practices including PCI-DSS (Payment Card Industry-Data Security Standard);

3) To identify Proposers with a proven approach to sharing data and system access with customer/agency management in a timely fashion to support contract oversight and planning functions; and

4) To identify Proposers with a high level of ability (i) assessing and managing risks within a complex IT organization involving legacy components and new technology, and (ii) finding creative solutions to ensure efficient and uninterrupted operations.

Evaluation Criteria:

The Proposer has demonstrated the ability to develop, implement, operate, maintain and upgrade an IT organization and related systems and elements, all in compliance with industry best practices. The Proposer has demonstrated its experience in complying with various best practices including, but not limited to, PCI-DSS. Furthermore, the Proposer has demonstrated reliable approaches to ensuring full data and system access with agency management to ensure proper oversight and monitoring, as well as the ability to ensure efficient and interrupted operations consisting of both legacy systems and new technology.

Instructions:

Evaluators must rate each requirement outlined in the table below as one of the following: (i) Exceptional; (ii) Good; (iii) Acceptable; (iv) Potential to Become Acceptable; or (v) Unacceptable. Please note the following explanations when rating each requirement:

1) A rating of Exceptional is appropriate when the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to significantly exceed stated criteria in a way that is beneficial to the MBTA. This rating indicates a consistently outstanding level of quality, with very little or no risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. There are no weaknesses.

2) A rating of Good is appropriate when the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to exceed stated criteria. This rating indicates a generally better than acceptable quality, with little risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor. Correction of the weaknesses would not be necessary before the Proposal would be considered further.

3) A rating of Acceptable is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to meet the stated criteria. This rating indicates an acceptable level of quality. The Proposal demonstrates a reasonable probability of success. Weaknesses exist but can be readily corrected through requests for Clarification or Communications.

4) A rating of Potential to Become Acceptable is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that fails to meet stated criteria as there are weaknesses, but they are susceptible to correction through Discussions. The response is considered marginal in terms of the basic content and/or amount of information provided for evaluation, but overall the Proposer is capable of providing an acceptable or better Proposal.

5) A rating of Unacceptable is appropriate if the Proposer has demonstrated an approach that indicates significant weaknesses and/or unacceptable quality. The Proposal fails to meet the stated criteria and/or lacks essential information and is conflicting and/or unproductive. There is no reasonable likelihood of success; weaknesses are so major and/or extensive that a major revision to the Proposal would be necessary.

Ratings for each requirement must be recorded in the associated Rating column, and a detailed explanation of why a particular rating was given to a requirement must be recorded in the associated Comments/Justification for Rating column. The Appendix B Section column identifies relevant sections of Appendix B (Operations and Management Proposal Instructions) to the Instructions to Proposers.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
1.	B10.2(A)	The Proposer shall provide an Information Technology Services Plan that describes in detail the Proposer's approach to providing the IT services described in the Contract including, but not limited to, Schedule 3.16 (Information Technology Requirements) of the Commuter Rail Operating Agreement. Elements of that Plan shall include, but not be limited to, proposed approaches to the following: 1. Delivering application and data interfaces; 2. Maintaining source code escrow; 3. Sustaining and/or transitioning the existing IT environment during mobilization; 4. Replacing and upgrading IT systems to keep the same in a state of good repair; 5. Tracking and escalating issues; 6. Understanding and utilizing new technologies such as RFID (radio frequency identification);	**Acceptable**	MBCR's Information Technology plan receives a rating of Acceptable. The plan appears to address each element of the MBTA RFP with some areas containing weaknesses that are correctable. The bulleted items listed below report the weaknesses; the two significant weaknesses that appear to require clarifications or communications based on my review are identified with an underlined reference at the end of the relevant bullets. • Operator Service Center staffing refers to inclusion of staff with expert personnel, but fails to include any information on what certifications or qualifications the expert personnel will posses or obtain. • The Issue Tracking Portal requirement includes an email notification to the MBTA, this proposal includes a detailed diagram on how the required inputs enter the Issue Tracking Portal, but the MBTA notification doesn't appear on the diagram and I didn't locate the notification to the MBTA for this element anywhere else. • My interpretation of the RFP includes the requirement for any changes to the MBTA owned IT environment to be approved by the MBTA before implementation. It appears as though there is the potential for MBCR initiated changes that are not categorized as "Significant" by MBCR to be implemented without MBTA approval. • MBTA access to all MBTA owned IT systems and data is critical to maximize contract oversight

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
		7. Documenting the IT environment; 8. Managing an IT organization and staff; 9. Conducting regular reviews and meetings with the MBTA; 10. Complying with MBTA and other applicable standards; 11. Applying sound change management, project management, and configuration management practices; 12. Operating an IT service center and responding to and repairing reported problems; 13. Performing root cause analyses; 14. Developing and implementing IT asset lifecycle plans; 15. Implementing a quality assurance program;		capability; the proposal does not make clear how this occurs or that the proposal approach included this as a priority. I was looking for statements in the proposal that would make clear that MBTA RROPS peer positions to MBCR employees performing contract services would have equal to or greater than access to the IT environment for review and report generation capabilities. This was not clear in the proposal. • The MBTA RFP references ANSI/ISO/ASQ Q9001-2000 or MBTA approved equivalent as the compliance criteria. I was unable to find any information on how the IT element would meet this requirement, the IT Quality section contained no reference to this or MBTA equivalent. <u>This is a weakness that can be corrected.</u> • The proposal was weak in regard to complying with RFP (PMI) Project Management Institute requirements. The proposal states that MBCR staff will receive additional training towards industry specific certifications, but nowhere does it say what employees will be trained or to what degree to perform the required tasks to achieve the outcomes expected by the MBTA. • Staffing for the IT element; the proposal is weak in regards to reporting the quantity of staff and their primary duties to perform required tasks. Additional information like the reference on page 9-13 where MBCR highlights 3 positions dedicated to significantly contribute to quality and content of IT

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
		16. Performing monitoring and reporting of performance of IT functions and complying with service level agreements; 17. Providing appropriate and timely access to MBTA to Operator IT staff and systems; and 18. Negotiating and managing contracts with IT suppliers responsibly and by seeking the best value at all times.		documentation would have been helpful. The Managing an IT Organization and Staff section on pages 9-14 through 9-16 were vague and without sufficient detail to clearly understand roles and responsibilities. The plan to have the CIO report to the CFO appears to lessen the importance of other functional areas that are critical for successful delivery of services to the MBTA customers as the CFO may not be highly engaged in the delivery of all operational functions and associated services. • MBCR appears to modify the intended RFP requirement of a single purpose IT Change Control Board for reviewing and approving proposed changes to a dual function by also having the same individuals comprise the IT Steering Committee to form the "IT Steering Committee Change Authorization Board" - this may have a negative impact on the original intent of the RFP for distinct separate functioning groups. <u>This weakness can be corrected.</u> •
2.	B10.2(B)	The Proposer shall: (i) identify those portions of the information that it provided in response to B9.2(A)(1) – (18) of Appendix B that it considers to be innovative, best practice, beneficial to MBTA Customers and/or cost efficient, and (ii) submit information supporting or otherwise validating its position that said	**Acceptable**	MBCR supplied the requested information. It appears as though the cost efficiencies and best practices are possible to achieve. Two items are reported to be innovative: I would not consider either item to be innovative as it appears that both are either already in place to some degree for current MBTA service or have been deployed successfully in passenger transit organizations in the U.S, Europe or Asia.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (INDIVIDUAL)

EVALUATION FACTOR: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES PLAN (RATED)

Requirement No.	Appendix B Section	Requirement	Rating	Comments/Justification for Rating
		portions are innovative, best practice, beneficial to MBTA Customers and/or cost efficient.		

#25368515_v1

10/31/2013